To: Fraser, Scott[Fraser.Scott@epa.gov]
Cc: Ragland, Micah[Ragland.Micah@epa.gov]

From: Daguillard, Robert

Sent: Thur 8/13/2015 3:58:28 PM

Subject: FW: Question regarding intentional pollution to justify funding

As discussed.

From: Daguillard, Robert

Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 11:58 AM

To: 'Christopher Kirkland'

Subject: RE: Question regarding intentional pollution to justify funding

Good morning Christopher and thank you for reaching out.

Going back to our phone conversation, I understand you're writing on behalf of a Super PAC, but I didn't quite get the name? Would you care to remind me?

Also and as discussed over the phone, I'm sharing your e-mail with my colleagues in the Office of Public Engagement, who reach out to and interact with stakeholder. I understand from our conversation that you'd like a response, ideally, by today, but my colleagues will let us know what's feasible.

Thank you again for reaching out.

Best, R.

From: Christopher Kirkland [mailto Personal Email/Ex. 6

Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 11:34 AM

To: Daguillard, Robert

Subject: Question regarding intentional pollution to justify funding

Robert,
Wow - I didn't know how else to address the subject line, but there it is. The article can be found here:
http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-08-12/did-epa-intentionally-poison-animas-river-secure-superfund-money
FYI, we have contacted the newspaper, and they said the story and it's timing are legitimate. Mark Esper wrote it, and is the editor of the paper.
Our questions are thus:
How much money does EPA estimate it will have to use to clean up their own mess?
Would EPA agree that Superfund money is the only way to fix this spill?
How may jobs will that sustain/provide for EPA?
And most importantly:
Why was the council and opinion or Mr. Esper and others not heeded? Why did EPA proceed with the plugging despite these expert opinions as to the effect? What expert opinions concluded such an outcome would NOT happen? Orin otherwords
Regards,

Chris Kirkland